

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. All claims are original; no amendments have been made to the pending claims.

Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-24 stand rejected as being anticipated by Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,785) under 35 USC § 102(e). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Anticipation by a prior invention or printed publication can only occur if all of the later invention's basic elements are contained in a single invention or a single publication. The Office Action maintains that all claims are anticipated indicating that all of Applicant's recited elements are found within Craig. The first claims to be addressed by the Office Action are independent claims 1, 9, and 17. The Office Action states that Craig discloses a customizable web site access system that includes a display duration for each of the plurality of URLs. In support of this, the Office Action recites that following and states that it is found within Col. 3, lines 6-65 of Craig:

Each URL in the working list has assigned a listing duration level of permanence, which controls how long the URL will be kept or maintained present in the working list, as well as an indication of the circumstances under which it will be removed from the list. This level of listing duration permanence is visible to, and may be modified by, the system user. In addition each URL on the working list has an assigned level of activity duration permanence for controlling how long the URL will be kept active, and of the circumstances under which it will be deactivated.

Applicant is unable to find the paragraph recited above in Col. 3, lines 6-65 of Craig or anywhere within Craig. Rather, the paragraph recited above appears to have, at least in part,

come from the Abstract of Bertram et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,812). The Abstract of Bertram et al. is as follows:

A network browser is provided with working list maintenance and creation facility which contains an indicator for each URL's listing duration level of permanence for controlling how long a URL will be kept or maintained in the working list and also includes an activity duration permanence level indicator for controlling how long the URL will be kept active. This enables the browser to maintain multiple, concurrently active URLs and thereby enable the browser to provide the functional emulation of a desktop working environment to the user.

As such, it appears that Bertram et al. is indeed the source for the provision of a “display duration” and thus, the 35 USC § 102 rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to a display duration, Craig gives no time of duration other than the instructor/student manually selecting a previous or next slide button, i.e., the time duration is not preset. The user, whether instructor or student, is not provided with the opportunity to set an actual time of duration see the GUI of Fig. 2 and Col. 8, Lines 59-61 of Craig (buttons are previous, next, or synchronize). When in synchronize mode, the student is under control of the instructor and the instructor must manually select the next/previous slide to move through the presentation (see Col. 10, Lines 32-37 of Craig). The standalone instructor session operates just like a standalone student session in that the instructor is provided only with the choices of previous, next or synchronize; the GUI is the same for both instructor and student (see Col. 9, Lines 29-31). This means that the only way of moving through the slide show is not by selecting a duration time and automatically moving through the slides as claimed by the present invention but only by manual selection of a next or previous button. In view of the absence of a “display duration,” Applicant again requests that the rejection under 35 USC § 102 be withdrawn.

In the instance that the original rejection was indeed meant to be a 35 USC § 103 rejection of claims 1-24 in view of Craig and further in view of Bertram et al., as circumstances indicate it should have been, Applicant respectfully traverses the possible 35 USC § 103 rejection as well. Craig describes a system for synchronizing a student's slide show with that of an instructor's slide show. The goal is for the instructor to be able to move through his slide show presentation at his own desired pace, e.g., lingering on one slide while quickly passing on another, while simultaneously allowing a student to be on the same slide as the instructor. (See Col. 1, Lines 65-67 to Col. 2, Line 4). Because the goal of the invention is to allow for self-pacing of a slide presentation, the use of an automatic timer (e.g., a set duration display time) would defeat the purpose of the Craig invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly K. Baxter
Registration No. 40,504

Customer No. 24113
Patterson, Thuent, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.
4800 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100
Telephone: (612) 349-5750